

# THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL

VOLUME IX

NOVEMBER 1913

NUMBER 2

## Editorial

### THE FINANCES OF THE JOURNAL

It is highly desirable that every member of the Association should know the main facts of the financial relations of the *Journal* and of *Classical Philology* to the general finances of the Association. An understanding of the facts would prevent occasional criticisms of the policy of furnishing *Classical Philology* to all members, and should prevent some suggestions that are made for expending the funds of the Association. Explanations were made to the comparatively few who attended the meetings at which the contracts with the Press were discussed and adopted, but we do not remember that any explanation has ever been given in the *Journal* for the benefit of the many who could not attend.

During the first five years of its existence the Association was bound by contract to pay to the University of Chicago Press \$1.50 of every \$2.00 membership fee received. The amount so paid was combined with a large subsidy given to *Classical Philology* from other sources, and the fund thus created was used in common for publishing the *Journal* and *Classical Philology*. This fund was so administered that at no time did the Association pay more than twenty-five or thirty cents for *Classical Philology*, an amount too small to pay for even the paper, presswork, binding, and mailing of the copies sent to its members. It is obvious that during this period only fifty cents of each membership fee could be used for all such general expenses as those of the secretary-treasurer, the vice-presidents, the annual meetings. There was therefore an automatic check on the amounts that could be voted for those purposes.

In 1910 a new contract was entered into for a term of five years, by which the Association publishes the *Journal* independently, issuing as many numbers, of as many pages each, as it can pay for. Therefore the Association is not now bound to devote any fixed portion of its income to the *Journal*. Since the Association was no longer the untried experiment which it had been at the time of making the first contract, it no longer needed to avail itself of the generosity of the University of Chicago. Though it could not pay its full share of the total expense of *Classical Philology*, it did agree to pay for the paper, presswork, binding, and mailing of the copies sent to its members. Past experience showed that this amounted to about forty cents a year per member, and this sum is stipulated in the contract.

*Classical Philology* is intentionally and professedly a journal of more technical scholarship than the *Journal*. It is well understood that most of its contents cannot be of interest to many members of the Association. In fact, it is doubtful whether any man but the managing editor ever reads it all, and sometimes we have doubts about him. It was a question whether it should be furnished to all members. The most obvious solution was to offer it only to those who cared to pay forty cents for it, but complications with the postal regulations stood in the way. If memory serves correctly, \$1.50 was the lowest price at which it could be sent on that plan.

The question was, then, whether *Classical Philology* should be sent to all members, or whether the forty cents should be added to the amount spent on the *Journal*. Two considerations determined the answer: first, not only did many members value *Classical Philology* highly, but it was felt that all must profit, to a greater or less extent, by its visible demonstration of the possibilities of higher scholarship; second, it was certain that those who do not value *Classical Philology* would gain no advantage if the *Journal* were enlarged and sent to members in place of both. For under the present arrangement the editors can and do exclude more technical articles on the ground that they should appear in *Classical Philology*, and that our members will get them there; but if only the *Journal* were sent to members we should certainly have to include a large pro-

portion of such articles. The added pages of the *Journal* would not interest those who do not care for *Classical Philology*.

The new contract removed the check on the general expenses of the Association, and no new check has been imposed by any rule that a certain fixed proportion of the income must be devoted to the *Journal*. If there were such a rule, every increase in membership and every economy on the part of the editors would mean an increase in the size of the *Journal*, instead of an increased balance on hand in the treasurer's report and an increased temptation to vote funds for other purposes. To most of the members who are not able to attend the meetings the *Journal* is the one big thing in the Association; or, at any rate, the editors must be pardoned for thinking so.

In the absence of such provision for the *Journal* there is need of continuous and careful self-restraint in voting on the expenditure of money. The income of the *Journal* was somewhat curtailed when the new contract provided for increasing the price of *Classical Philology*. If the general expenses exceed those which were allowed by the old contract, its income will be further curtailed. It is true that there are many entirely legitimate purposes for which everyone would be glad to see money expended liberally: the secretary-treasurer should be given adequate office assistance; the editorial office should have some stenographic help; more liberal provision should be made for the expenses of vice-presidents; above all, the Association should go much farther than it has in paying the expenses of its meetings. In fact, the entire income of the Association could be spent legitimately in these and other ways. But then there would be no *Journal*—and no Association. That the Association has grown to a strength not hoped for by its founders is due to the greatness of the advantages it has offered. These advantages have been made possible only by a sacrifice of time and money on the part of all who have had to do with its affairs. If the advantages are to continue, the sacrifices must continue.

## A NOTE ON THE TRIBUNATE OF TI. GRACCHUS<sup>1</sup>

BY EVAN T. SAGE  
University of Washington

I cannot agree with those historians who hope to solve all the present by simple reference to the past; still less can I follow those who claim that the past has no lesson for us. Ancient history, especially Roman history, does have meaning for us. Their experience is no longer regarded as an epitome of all possible political history, but it can at least teach us some things to avoid if we wish to escape their fate. With this in mind, I wish to study the tribunate of Tiberius Gracchus.

Lecturing recently on the events of the year 133 B.C., I used, half-unconsciously, the words, "Octavius was recalled." Later, realizing the language I had used, I was led to wonder how far the modern term and the ancient practice corresponded. The following paper is the result of my curiosity. I do not feel sure that I have all the evidence, but I do believe that additions will not materially alter the conclusion.

Let us first review briefly the events that led up to the deposition of Octavius. We must begin with the Roman conservation problem, which was almost as old as the republic. The public land, acquired by conquest, was theoretically distributed in small parcels at a moderate rental among the poorer citizens, that they might be better able to bear the burdens the state imposed upon them. Perhaps at some times, the state, through lack of time to make the proper allotment, allowed the land to be worked by anyone who would pay a moderate share of the crop to the state.<sup>2</sup> Through this, or some other method, the rich gradually gained possession of large tracts of the public domain. The Licinian laws of 367 B.C. limited the amount of public land that anyone might

<sup>1</sup> Read at the meeting of the Classical Association of the Pacific Northwest, Portland, Ore., November 28, 1912.

<sup>2</sup> Appian *B.C.* i. 7.

hold, but this provision was not always enforced. The war with Hannibal assisted in the ruin of Italian agriculture and drove the small farmers to Rome in great numbers. The nobles took possession of much of the land thus made vacant, and converted it into pleasure grounds, game preserves, and cattle and sheep ranges worked by slaves. The correction of these abuses was considered by various men, notably by C. Laelius. He went so far as to draft a reform measure, but, foreseeing opposition, gave up the task and received as his reward, it would seem, the surname of *Sapiens*.

In 133 Ti. Gracchus was elected tribune of the people and proposed what was virtually a re-enactment of the agrarian provisions of the Licinian laws.<sup>1</sup> His proposal met with determined opposition. We have enough specimens of Roman debates on such laws to know that they might be printed today in such a case as the one involving the Alaska coal fields with only changes of names. The opposition came from two classes as hard to distinguish then as now, those who were consciously violating the laws that already existed, and those, among whom were many of the Italian allies, who had in good faith bought and improved land and thought they had clear title. When the clerk of the assembly was about to read the bill, another tribune, M. Octavius, interposed his veto. Tradition says or suggests that he was influenced by improper motives. I cannot disprove it, but his conduct in the whole affair rather wins my respect. When this interruption occurred, Gracchus proclaimed a *justitium*. This institution, which involved a suspension of all public and private business, especially the closing of the treasury and the cessation of legal proceedings,<sup>2</sup> was only rarely resorted to. The tribune Licinius had used it to compel the passage of the legislation bearing his name. The senate tried in vain to reconcile the two tribunes, and then Gracchus entered on a new course of action. He proposed that either he or Octavius be retired from office by vote of the people, to avert civil war. Naturally Octavius declined, thinking such procedure illegal. Thereupon

<sup>1</sup> The facts in the following account are derived mainly from Plutarch *Ti. Gracchus* 10 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Cic. *de Har. Res.* 26. 55; Liv. iii. 27. 2.

Gracchus put the question to the people on the deposition of Octavius. The general principle involved seems to have been whether a tribune who acted contrary to the people's interests did not *ipso facto* forfeit his office. The term "people's interests" was as usual not defined, but generally it meant the wishes of the people or the leaders who controlled them. Before all the tribes had voted, Tiberius again implored Octavius to withdraw his veto and save himself from dismissal, but when the latter remained firm Gracchus allowed the vote to continue and Octavius was deposed. It is impossible and unnecessary to determine whether Gracchus was moved by his friendship for Octavius, by a desire to play to the gallery, or by a growing premonition that he was starting a movement that might have most serious political consequences, the responsibility for which he would gladly avoid. All have been suggested, and probably all are partly true.

But criticism of Gracchus was not wanting. A certain Annius asked him a question which he could not answer. The question was perfectly simple and obvious, but so far as I know it has never been squarely met and answered. As Plutarch reports it,<sup>1</sup> it was this: "If you had a design to disgrace and defame me, and I should appeal to one of your colleagues for protection, would you therefore fall into a passion and depose him?" Gracchus, usually so ready of speech, was visibly disconcerted and adjourned the assembly. Later he defended himself in a set speech of which the outline is preserved by Plutarch.<sup>2</sup> Its argument has been justly criticized as sophistical and irrelevant. Apparently it did not silence the critics, for Gracchus felt compelled to seek re-election. Accused of seeking royal power, he was killed by the nobles.

On the question of the deposition, scholars disagree. Ancient authority generally condemned it as a violation of the sacrosanctity of the tribune. Even Plutarch calls it "neither legal nor fair." Cicero goes so far as to call it *seditio* (*Mil.* 27. 72; cf. *Brut.* 27. 103). Moderns are more concerned with the constitutional problem. Most historians regard the deposition as at best unusual, if not unconstitutional or even revolutionary. Some call it subversive of

<sup>1</sup> Plut. *op. cit.* 14.

<sup>2</sup> Plut. *op. cit.* 15.

the principles of stable government.<sup>1</sup> Ferrero<sup>2</sup> calls it "new and quite unconstitutional" and goes blithely on with the statement that after it Gracchus frankly became a demagogue. Niebuhr,<sup>3</sup> Beesly,<sup>4</sup> Botsford,<sup>5</sup> Pöhlmann<sup>6</sup> defend it more or less perfunctorily. Yet few of the handbooks provide us with the necessary evidence to form an opinion. It is my task to supply some of that evidence, and, without venturing to pronounce an unqualified judgment, to present and interpret the material. Various questions suggest themselves. If this procedure was unusual, how did the Romans control their magistrates and keep them in accord with public opinion? Was there anything corresponding to the recall? How did they get rid of magistrates who were obnoxious to them? Answers, more or less satisfactory, can be found for these questions.

The problem of an undesirable magistrate confronted the Romans at the very beginning of the republic. Brutus' assistant in the expulsion of Tarquin the Proud was Tarquinius Collatinus, whom the people suspected on account of his name and family ties. Two different versions of his fate are recorded. Cicero,<sup>7</sup> following what Mommsen<sup>8</sup> says is the older tradition, says that Brutus forced him to give up his office. With this Dio<sup>9</sup> agrees. On the other hand, Livy<sup>10</sup> clearly states that he abdicated. An attempt was made to remove his successor, P. Valerius, charged with seeking royal power, but he defended himself and was acquitted.<sup>11</sup> The abdication of a magistrate was possible, but it seems to have been, in form at least, voluntary. The bringing of pressure to bear on a magistrate to induce him to resign seems to suggest a lack of any means of compelling his resignation. Cases of abdication under pressure were not uncommon. M. Claudio Glicia, dictator in 249 B.C., suffered this fate, but Glicia was probably a

<sup>1</sup> E.g., Abbott, *Roman Political Institutions* (Boston, 1902), 96.

<sup>2</sup> *Greatness and Decline of Rome* (New York, 1907), I, 47.

<sup>3</sup> *Lectures on the History of Rome*, 3d ed. (London, 1870), 502 f.

<sup>4</sup> *The Gracchi, Marius and Sulla* (New York, 1904), 32 f.

<sup>5</sup> *Roman Assemblies* (New York, 1909), 367 f.

<sup>6</sup> *Sitzb. d. bayer. Akad.*, 1907, 465 f.

<sup>7</sup> *Brut.* 14. 53; *de Off.* iii. 10. 40.

<sup>8</sup> *Röm. Staatsr.*, I, 629.

<sup>9</sup> 46. 49.

<sup>10</sup> ii. 2. 10.

<sup>11</sup> Liv. ii. 7. 5 f.

freedman and was appointed by his patron as an insult to the senate.<sup>1</sup> An unsuccessful attempt was made by the senate to force Flamininus, consul in 223 and 217 B.C., to resign his former consulship on account of defects in the auspices.<sup>2</sup> This seems to have been the stock excuse. Compulsory resignation was probably the lot of the Catilinarian Lentulus in 63 B.C., though the texts are ambiguous.<sup>3</sup> The consuls T. Veturius and Sp. Postumius, who were defeated at the Caudine Forks, resigned, doubtless urged by the senate.<sup>4</sup> A higher magistrate could suspend a lower, while a dictator could apparently compel a resignation.<sup>5</sup> E.g., the dictator Cincinnatus reduced the consul Minucius to the rank of *legatus*,<sup>6</sup> and the dictator L. Papirius Cursor forbade his master of the horse, Q. Fabius Rullianus, *quicquam pro magistratu agere*.<sup>7</sup> (Of course Livy's well-known weakness on constitutional history permits a degree of uncertainty regarding cases where he is the only source.)

A striking and difficult case of abrogation is that of Q. Fabius Maximus Cunctator, made dictator after the defeat at the Trasimene Lake in 217 B.C. The criticism of his master of the horse and the nature of his own policy had rendered him unpopular at home, and the tribune M. Metilius led a crusade against him. His language is so remarkable that I quote it at length: "Quas ob res, si antiquus animus plebei Romanae esset, audaciter se laturum fuisse de abrogando Q. Fabii imperio; nunc modicam rogationem promulgaturum de aequando magistri equitum et dictatoris iure."<sup>8</sup> Whether the unusual manner of Fabius' nomination as dictator had anything to do with it or not, I cannot say.<sup>9</sup> At any rate the dictatorship was spared at other times, perhaps because the office was abandoned after 202.<sup>10</sup> It would be interesting to know the

<sup>1</sup> Liv. *Ep.* 19; Suet. *Tib.* 2.

<sup>2</sup> Liv. *xxi.* 63. 1 f.

<sup>3</sup> Cic. *in Cat.* iii. 6. 15; iv. 3. 5; Dio 37. 34; Sall. *Cat.* 47; Plut. *Cic.* 19.

<sup>4</sup> Liv. *ix.* 10. 2.

<sup>5</sup> Liv. *v.* 9. 6; *xxx.* 24. 3.

<sup>6</sup> Liv. *iii.* 29. 2.

<sup>7</sup> Liv. *viii.* 36. 1.

<sup>8</sup> Liv. *xxii.* 25. 4 f., esp. 10.

<sup>9</sup> Liv. *xxii.* 8. 5.

<sup>10</sup> Abbott, *op. cit.*, 183.

real reason for Metilius' not proposing the recall of Fabius. The dictatorship was so peculiar an office that it may have been held in especial reverence.

The attitude toward the proconsul was rather different, and attempts to abrogate that power were made early. The first case that I have noted is that of M. Claudius Marcellus, proconsul in 209 B.C. A tribune, C. Publicius Bibulus, proposed his recall. Marcellus returned to Rome and defended himself so vigorously that the charge against him was dropped, and to console him for his chagrin, the people elected him to his fifth consulship on the following day.<sup>1</sup> In 204 B.C. such a strict conservative as Fabius Maximus suggested an attempt on Scipio through the agency of a tribune, but nothing came of it.<sup>2</sup> The earliest successful attempt was that in the case of M. Aemilius Lepidus in 136 B.C.<sup>3</sup> There is no real reason to believe, except the lack of a definite statement, that this had not been thought of before 209, but in any case, it would hardly serve as a precedent for the deposition of a regular magistrate like the tribune.

If we except the possible case of Collatinus, and the proposal of Metilius, which not even he was willing to follow up, we have, apparently, no precedent for Gracchus' action. The reasons may perhaps be found. The Roman term of office was short, and not much would be gained by haste. The case of Marcellus shows that this was of minor importance. The true reason is probably the Roman theory that the executive was a branch of the government co-ordinate with the people.<sup>4</sup> We must allow too for the characteristic Roman reverence for tradition and constitutional form. Yet the power of the people had been wrested from the senate and the magistrate by repeated violations of tradition and established form, and if the principle appealed to by Gracchus is capable of defense it is on the ground of the necessity of popular sovereignty. This argument of course can be used to prove almost anything, e.g., the justice of conferring extraordinary powers on

<sup>1</sup> Liv. xxvii. 20. 11 f.; Plut. *Marc.* 19.

<sup>2</sup> Liv. xxix. 19. 6.

<sup>3</sup> Appian *Iber.* 83.

<sup>4</sup> Greenidge, *History of Rome* (London, n.d.), I, 120 f.; Mommsen, *loc. cit.*

Pompey in 66 B.C. Gracchus seems to have recognized later that his act might lead to serious results, and in his defense he tried to repudiate the view that the sanctity of the tribune had been violated. Granting the violation, it seemed to him more desirable that the people should rule than that the majesty of the tribune should be preserved. Whether Gracchus was moved by the possible precedents I have cited cannot be determined. I suspect that he was not. Furthermore, I suspect that he was so completely absorbed in the present that he took little heed of the past or the future. On this ground it seems to me that his conduct is indefensible. All constitutional methods had not been exhausted. It was not absolutely necessary that the bill be carried just then. If Gracchus had been a little more patient he could probably have secured the election of a sympathetic college of tribunes for the next year, and the severe strain on established custom would have been avoided. As it was, Gracchus was hurried from one step of doubtful constitutionality to another, until his name became associated in men's minds with revolution. It may be argued that the forms Tiberius broke through were already worn out, as our constitution and traditions seem to some politicians now; it may be argued that a tribune like Octavius, who disregarded the popular will for whatever motive, was an anomaly, but these considerations cannot free Gracchus entirely from the responsibility of having hastened the revolution.

Let us now trace briefly the history of the recall movement after Gracchus. L. Servilius Caepio, consul in 105 B.C., was defeated by the Cimbri, brought to trial by the tribune C. Norbanus, and deposed.<sup>1</sup> Livy (*loc. cit.*) says of him: "primo . . . post regem Tarquinium imperium ei abrogatum." Livy, as we have seen, did not believe that Collatinus was deposed. L. Cornelius Cinna, consul in 87 B.C., was deposed by the senate, but the army did not admit their right to do so. He returned to the city with Marius and coerced the senate into recognizing him again.<sup>2</sup> When Cinna was deposed, L. Merula was chosen to fill the vacancy, but was crowded out by the restoration of Cinna.<sup>3</sup> Three years later,

<sup>1</sup> Cic. *de Or.* ii. 28. 124; ii. 47. 197; Liv. *Ep.* 67.

<sup>2</sup> Appian *B.C.* i. 65 f.; Vell. ii. 20.

<sup>3</sup> Appian *loc. cit.*

another Marian, the consul Cn. Papirius Carbo, refused to come to Rome to hold the elections, but was threatened with deposition by the tribunes and yielded.<sup>1</sup> In 53 B.C. a tribune, Lucilius, suggested that Pompey be made dictator and was threatened by Cato with loss of office.<sup>2</sup> Two other tribunes suffered in 45 B.C. C. Epidius Marullus and L. Caesetius Flavus stripped the crowns from Caesar's statues and were deposed—an act of the great dictator's which even his most enthusiastic admirer must regret.<sup>3</sup> Another tribune, P. Servilius Casca, met a similar fate in 43 B.C.<sup>4</sup> In the same year a praetor, Q. Gallius, was accused of plotting against the life of Octavianus, and, according to one form of the story, was stripped of his office by his colleagues.<sup>5</sup>

Two things may be noted, the greater number of cases and the greater variety of methods. The tribunes, the senate, and apparently the colleagues of the victim assumed the function. It must be said, however, that the language of Latin authors is often so ambiguous that we cannot distinguish between deposition and forced resignation.

To my mind, the episode and its consequences have less significance than the spirit that made it possible. The violation of form (to use the mildest term) of which Gracchus was guilty was, it seems to me, symptomatic of the whole attitude of the people, and here is the lesson for us. Possibly, strictly speaking, the deposition of Octavius was not unconstitutional. Possibly it can be justified on the ground that the will of the people must and shall prevail. Possibly there were precedents, or the people made their own precedents, as Cicero boasted later that they did in the case of Pompey.<sup>6</sup> The evidence that any of these possibilities is true has not yet appeared. The real significance of the affair, to my mind, is that the Romans were far more interested in a temporary situation than in a general principle. They were willing

<sup>1</sup> Appian *B.C.* i. 78.

<sup>2</sup> Plut. *Pomp.* 54.

<sup>3</sup> Dio xliv. 10; Plut. *Caes.* 61.

<sup>4</sup> Dio xlvi. 49.

<sup>5</sup> Appian *B.C.* iii. 95; Suet. *Aug.* 27.

<sup>6</sup> *de Imp. Cn. Pomp.* 61.

to overlook the doubtful legality of the motion, to violate the sacrosanctity of the tribune and interfere with the exercise of his veto power, if it pleased the section of the people that happened to be in a majority in the assembly. They were willing to sacrifice the constitutional devices and traditions that had been accumulating for centuries, to accomplish their momentary will. I am not trying to defend the Roman constitution, nor to show that because an institution is old it is necessarily good. But when any people is ready, with no serious consideration, to disregard legal and constitutional forms of proved value, there is danger ahead. Of course the Roman people of this period was becoming more and more an ignorant, unscrupulous mob, with no real interest in politics, and the assembly was accustomed to agree to every proposal made to it. So much the stronger, then, was the need of deliberation before placing before them revolutionary proposals of any kind. I cannot feel that Tiberius intended to endanger the republic. I do not believe that he foresaw that his action would be a precedent for other similar actions by less conscientious men and on less important occasions, but on the other hand I do not believe that he even thought of these possibilities until it was too late. Therefore I cannot acquit him of the charge of having hastened the fall of the republic and of having threatened the principles of free government. To my mind, the beginning of the end came when Scipio Africanus declared that if the whole Roman people wanted him for aedile he was old enough.<sup>1</sup> From that time on politicians cultivated the willingness of the people to break down old restrictions. I need only mention the centralization of power in the hands of C. Gracchus, the repeated and successive consulships of Marius, the dictatorship of Sulla, and the extraordinary commands given Pompey and Caesar. For this tendency Tiberius Gracchus was partly responsible. What is the moral? The proverb is too true to be trite: Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty.

<sup>1</sup> Liv. xxv. 2. 7.

## ARCHAEOLOGY IN 1912

### PART I

BY GEORGE H. CHASE  
Harvard University

The year 1912 was noteworthy, not only for many interesting discoveries in Greek lands and in Italy, but also for the two wars which materially changed the political geography of the Eastern Mediterranean and incidentally influenced the development of archaeological research. The establishment of Italian rule in Tripoli put an end to all hope of further exploration by the American expedition to Cyrene. The Italians themselves, as soon as the war was over, made arrangements to organize their new province archaeologically, and the Italian papers have been full of reports of discoveries and plans for the future. Museums have been established at Tripoli-town and at Benghazi; the arch of Marcus Aurelius at Tripoli, which was largely hidden by mediaeval and modern structures, has been cleared and isolated; in the necropolis of the Roman Oea, near Tripoli (which occupies the site of this ancient Roman city), twenty-one rock-hewn tombs have been explored; and from a number of places chance discoveries of mosaics and other antiquities have been reported. It is noteworthy, however, that the excavation of Cyrene is "deferred to a time when political conditions become more settled," and it seems obvious that no thorough exploration of the "hinterland" can be undertaken for many years.

The effects of the Balkan War on archaeology are not as yet quite so evident, except, perhaps, in a negative way. During the fall of 1912 little was done anywhere in Greece, owing to the absence of officials and workmen alike. Several of the ephors were withdrawn from their posts for service in the army, and some of them, as opportunity offered, examined various sites in Macedonia. A passage in the brief report of the Ephor Arvanitopoulos gives a vivid picture of conditions in a few words, and in language which,

except for modern technical terms, would be perfectly intelligible to Xenophon: 'Απὸ τῆς 18ης σεπτεμβρίου 1912 ἐπιστρατεύθησι μετέσχον τῆς εἰς Μακεδονίαν ἐκστρατείας ὡς ἔφεδρος ἀξιωματικὸς τοῦ πυροβολικοῦ παρὰ τῷ 5ῃ μεραρχίᾳ καιροῦ ἐπιτρέψαντος, μετὰ τὴν τροπὴν τοῦ ἐναντίου στρατεύματος, μετέβησις εἰς τινα χωρία. . . . Dr. Arvanitopoulos states also that the ephor Papadakis, a volunteer in the Sixteenth Regiment, examined the remains of ancient Aeane and other sites and will present a report. All this suggests that interesting discoveries may be expected from the opening up of Macedonia and Thrace and the islands that have been freed from Turkish rule.

To pass from possibilities to actualities, it is pleasant to record that the most striking discoveries of the year in Greek lands were made by the Americans at Sardis. In a campaign of nearly five months, Professor Butler succeeded in clearing the eastern end of the temple of Artemis and so completed the excavation of this great building. The main features of the plan were made clear by the campaign of 1911,<sup>1</sup> but the complete excavation of the temple brought out many interesting details. The Ionic columns are richly decorated with patterns, so beautifully carved in many cases that they seem surely to date from the fourth century, B.C. In the bases, the upper torus is adorned with patterns of various kinds, oak and bay leaves, two sorts of water leaf, and the more conventional guilloche or plait-band; the capitals are decorated in some cases with palmettes (on the ovolo or echinus) and acanthus scrolls (on the volute band). The jambs of the great eastern door are triple banded, with delicate moldings between the bands. Curiously enough, many portions of the decoration, even in parts of the building that seem to date from the fourth century, are not completely carved, and the temple was clearly unfinished when the catastrophe of Roman times, probably the great earthquake of 17 A.D., necessitated the extensive repairs to which the later, imitative capitals and certain of the decorative patterns bear witness. One curious

<sup>1</sup> See *Classical Journal*, VIII, 99 f. The description which I there gave requires correction in two points. The temple was pseudodipteral, not pseudoperipteral (a careless slip of which I ought not to have been guilty), and there were twelve, not ten interior columns in the cultus chamber and two columns in the back chamber, or treasury.

result of the campaign of 1912 was the discovery of a small and very early Christian church which was built against the southeast angle of the temple at a time when the platform of the building and the bases of the columns had already been buried. The church is remarkably well preserved; the half-dome of the apse is still intact and the primitive altar, consisting of a slab of sandstone set upon a short section of a column, is still in place. In the necropolis, as in former years, many tombs were opened and the collections of vases and bronzes, jewelry and gems were largely increased. In two tombs vases of Attic black-figured ware were found, which should prove helpful in solving the difficult problem of dating the local pottery and other grave furniture. Among the single finds the most important was the bilingual inscription in Lydian and Aramaic mentioned in last year's report, but it has a rival in a long Greek inscription containing a letter from the emperor Augustus to the people of Sardis, dating from the year 4 B.C. In this occurs a reference which shows that a temple of Zeus stood in the same precinct as the temple of Artemis. This temple *may* be the temple of Zeus erected by Alexander the Great, which was built, according to Arrian (*Anabasis* i. 17. 6), on the foundations of the palace of Croesus, and its discovery, obviously, must be one of the principal objects of future campaigns.

At Pergamum the Germans under the direction of Professor Conze devoted their attention especially to the eastern part of the Gymnasium, removing the earth which has accumulated here from earlier excavations. They succeeded in reaching the eastern end and cleared an entrance gateway of Greek date. Explorations were also made along the roadway which leads to the citadel, above the region which has recently been excavated, and here the ruins of two buildings dating from the period of the kings of Pergamum, one of which had later been transformed into a Roman bath, were brought to light.

At Ephesus the work of the Austrians was confined to the harbor and the agora, but no very striking discoveries were made. The most important discoveries that I have noted were all made at the harbor—a propylon “somewhat resembling a Roman temple”; an arch, probably of the Augustan age; and a gateway of unusual

form (semicircular in plan on one side, straight on the other), dated by an inscription in the reign of Hadrian. All the work at this site is now undertaken primarily for the purpose of solving problems that arise in connection with the final publication of the results. Of this elaborate work, the *Forschungen in Ephesos*, the second volume, devoted to the Theater, appeared during the year.

For Miletus and Didyma the last reports that I have seen cover the year 1911 only. At Miletus only minor explorations were undertaken, but at Didyma the clearing of the cella of the temple of Apollo was pushed steadily forward. Many of the better preserved blocks were replaced on the walls, which were thus restored to a height of over 17 feet above the outer stylobate. In removing the débris from the eastern end of the cella, the excavators came upon the ruins of a late Byzantine chapel, and below this, the remains of a larger church, which may possibly be as early as the sixth century, A.D. It had been constructed in such a way that the apse rested on the broad flight of steps which led up from the cella of the temple to the higher level of the pronaos, and the steps themselves had been made to serve as seats inside the apse. After the ruins of the church had been carefully photographed and described they were removed, and the marble steps, twenty-two in number, were laid bare. They are said to be very well preserved, so that they furnish the best example yet known of an ancient monumental stairway.

At Samos the second campaign of excavation at the site of the famous Heraeum lasted from September, 1911, to May, 1912, but added little new information in regard to the temple. Not a single fragment of walls or entablature was found, nor were there any traces of interior supports, so that it seems certain that the great central chamber, which measures some 54×23 meters, was open to the sky. The examination of the peribolos revealed traces of a large rectangular altar east of the temple, an exedra with the base of a statue of the orator Cicero, and parts of a number of small temples or treasuries of the Imperial period. Several bases for statues of members of the Julian and Claudian families are thought to commemorate their generosity in restoring the Heraeum after the damage it suffered during the wars of the pirates.

In Crete Miss Edith Hall, working for the University of Penn-

sylvania Museum, continued at Vrokastro the excavations which were begun in 1910 (*Classical Journal*, VII, 68), devoting her attention especially to the geometric settlement on the summit of the hill and to locating the tombs connected with it. The results in the settlement were disappointing; the houses were poorly constructed and the single finds few. The tombs, on the other hand, proved decidedly interesting. Among them were six tholoi, with vases of the transitional style which marks the change from the Mycenaean age to the geometric period in Crete, and, in one case, Egyptian faience seals of the XX-XXII dynasties and parts of a bronze tripod. The weapons in the tombs were largely of iron, the smaller objects of bronze, and the methods of burial (inhumation and cremation were practiced side by side) give further evidence of the transitional nature of the tombs. Besides the tholoi several tombs of a type not hitherto noted for the transitional age in Crete were discovered, namely, "bone enclosures," like those of the Middle Minoan period found at Palaikastro, in which the bones of a number of persons were deposited together. In these cremation was the rule and the pottery was largely of fully developed geometric style.

At Haghia Triada Dr. Halbherr is reported to have found a large deposit of inscribed tablets, almost all accounts, and a well-preserved shrine of the Late Minoan III period.

At Gortyn the Italians under Dr. Pernier nearly completed the excavation of the Odeum on which the law code is inscribed. Among the finds were five new fragments of the code, two dedications by agoranomoi, and a list of officials called kosmoi. These inscriptions and others appear to confirm the theory of Halbherr that this region formed a part of the agora of Gortyn; it was inhabited from the geometric age and must have contained important buildings in the archaic period, including a round building, from the ruins of which the great inscription was taken. In addition to the examination of the Odeum, some work was done in the neighborhood of the sanctuary of Apollo Pythius, especially in the so-called Basilica or Praetorium, the ruins of which were seen and studied by Venetian travelers in the sixteenth century. These explorations, which were conducted by Dr. Porro, yielded several new inscriptions and statues.

Of the work of the French School at Delos I have seen no reports except an occasional mention of single finds.

At Thasos Messrs. Picard and Avezou, of the French School, carried on further investigations in the vicinity of the Gate of the Satyr and the arch of Caracalla (*Classical Journal*, VIII, 107, 108). Among the buildings discovered were several houses of the Greek period, a Hellenistic heroön, a sixth century temple, and a hypostyle hall which resembles the Thersilion at Megalopolis and was probably a place for public assemblies. But the most interesting feature of the year's work was the careful examination of the building from which the famous "reliefs from Thasos" in the Louvre were taken. From the subjects of these reliefs—Apollo with Nymphs and Hermes with the Graces—and the inscription, Νίμφησιν κάπολλωνι νυμφηγέτη θῆλυ καὶ ἄρσεν διμ βούλη προσέρδεν· οὖν οὐ θέμις οὐδὲ χοῖρον· οὐ παιωνίζεται, it has commonly been held that they formed the decoration of an altar, though many other theories have been advanced. The investigations of the French explorers showed that the building from which they came was a sort of passage or corridor leading to a larger structure. The reliefs were simply set into the walls of the building, which appears to be of the archaic period. Thus all the earlier theories as to their use are overthrown, and the question can only be settled, if it can be settled at all, by the excavation of the larger building and the determination of its character.

From Athens no very startling discoveries have been reported. The Greek Society continued the restoration of the Propylaea and the exploration of the Pnyx, and carried on a number of minor excavations in the city and in Attica. The most important of the latter were perhaps those at Sunium, where Dr. Stais continued to examine the filling earth in the precinct of Athena, a task to which he has devoted himself at intervals for several years. From the earth turned over in 1912, mostly in the eastern part of the sanctuary where the depth of the "fill" is some two and one-half meters, were recovered many parts of the superstructure of the earlier temple of Athena, which is supposed to have been ruined by the Persians during the invasion of Xerxes, and broken votive offerings. These include vases of proto-Corinthian, Corinthian, and

Rhodian style; painted tablets (one showing armed men on a ship); archaic terra cotta figurines; bronze tripods, pins, and rings; about a hundred Egyptian scarabs; and gold and silver beads. The most important single find was an Ionic capital from the second temple, which shows that this building, erected immediately after the Persian Wars, had Ionic columns—the earliest example, so far as is known, of the use of this order in Attica.

From the Peloponnesus, too, there is not much to record. At Tiryns, some further examination of the Mycenaean palace and the walls of the citadel was undertaken by the Germans. The removal of the Byzantine church showed that it was not built over the ruins of a Greek temple, as has usually been assumed; below it were found only Mycenaean walls. Shafts sunk at various points threw new light on the earlier palace and its walls of defense, showing that the earlier palace was built early in the prehistoric age, remodeled in the L.M. I and II periods, and replaced by the existing palace in L.M. III. Among the remains of pre-Mycenaean occupation, the most interesting are the thick walls of a large circular building, constructed of crude brick on a stone foundation. Of the official publication of the recent work at this site, entitled *Tiryns: die Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen des Instituts*, two volumes appeared during 1912. The Germans are reported to have worked also at Cleonae, but I have seen no account of the results.

At Argos Professor Vollgraff, of the University of Groningen, continued the excavations which he has carried on at intervals since 1902, and which have gradually brought to light many parts of the ancient city, including the stadium, the gymnasium, the sanctuaries of Apollo Pythius and Artemis Oxyderkes, and a large part of the agora, with its inclosing colonnades. So far as I know, no regular reports of Dr. Vollgraff's explorations are published, so that it is impossible to gain a clear impression of the results from year to year.

At Elis the Austrians met with no better fortune than in 1910 and 1911. A campaign of six weeks was rewarded only by unimportant single finds and very slight remains of buildings—a palestra, two stoae, and a small temple (or treasury)—which are thought to mark the site of the ancient agora.

In Central Greece Miss Walker and Miss Goldman, of the American School, again worked with much success at Halae. In the cemetery many new graves were opened, and on the acropolis a trial trench yielded prehistoric pottery and a large deposit of bronze ornaments. The objects found in the graves included a pair of earrings, a crown, and a small pendant of gold; silver fibulae with engraved, conventional designs; seal rings of silver and bronze; several figurines of "Tanagra" types; a number of excellent black-figured cylixes; and local pottery which shows the influence of Corinthian and Attic black-figured ware.

At Delphi, where the members of the French School are still conducting minor excavations in connection with the publication of the *Fouilles de Delphes*, Mr. Replat, the architect of the School, discovered near the temple of Athena Pronaia a headless draped female figure of the first half of the fifth century, which is said to suggest the "Iris" of the east pediment of the Parthenon. The statue was found just at the beginning of the war with Turkey, and since it was reported to represent Nike, its discovery was hailed as an omen throughout Greece. Quite apart from this adventitious fame, however, it is undoubtedly an important addition to the comparatively small number of original Greek statues of the fifth century.

Farther west, at Thermon, the Ephor Rhomaios, in investigating the earth below the level of the temple of Apollo, found traces of prehistoric houses with apses, similar to those which came to light in the lowest levels at Olympia. That they date from the second millennium, B.C., and show the early occupation of this district is proved by the existence of prehistoric pottery with geometric decoration and some Mycenaean vases. In the earth around an early altar, also, was found a bronze figurine which resembles late Mycenaean types.

[*To be continued*]

## CAESURAL EMPHASIS IN THE *ILIAD*

BY FRANK L. CLARK  
Miami University

The object of this paper is to call attention to the fact of caesural emphasis, particularly in the *Iliad*, and to study a few selected examples for the light they throw upon the general tone of the passages involved.

Caesural emphasis is emphasis of position. It is not affected by the question of the presence or absence of an ictus, or stress accent, in Greek and Latin verse. By caesural emphasis I mean the emphasis, or prominence, which is often, in the Homeric poems and elsewhere, given to the single word immediately preceding the caesural pause or the principal diaeresis.

That such emphasis exists can be proved by numerous examples. But this feature of Homeric verse does not seem to have received the study it deserves. Little or no attention is paid to it in our school editions of the *Iliad*, or even in larger editions, and a search made a few years ago through the literature of the classics since the sixteenth century (in Engelmann and Bursian) failed to reveal any monograph whose title would indicate that it treated this subject. The only reference to the subject which I have been able to discover is in an article in *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, Vol. III (1892), pp. 91-129, by the late Professor T. D. Seymour of Yale "On the Homeric Caesura and the Close of the Verse as Related to the Expression of Thought," in the course of which Professor Seymour calls attention to the fact "that a musical rest in the midst of a sentence, and especially between words which are bound in close grammatical union, involves distinct emphasis upon the preceding word" (p. 114).

But Seymour makes no detailed study of emphasis upon single words. Such emphasis is especially noticeable when it occurs in several successive verses, e.g., *Iliad* i. 92-96. Note the emphasis upon θάρσησε, εὐχωλῆς, ἀρητῆρος, θύγατρα.

καὶ τὸτε δὴ θάρσησε || καὶ ηῦδα μάντις ἀμύμων.  
 “οὖτ’ ἄρ’ ὁ γ’ εὐχωλῆς || ἐπιμέμφεται οὐθ’ ἑκατόμβης,  
 ἀλλ’ ἐνεκ’ ἀρητῆρος, || ὃν ἡτίμησ’ Ἀγαμέμνων,  
 οὐδ’ ἀπέλυσε θύγατρα || καὶ οὐκ ἀπεδέξατ’ ἀποινα, . . . .”

It will be observed that the most important words, or keywords, of the passage are placed just before the caesural pause.

Another good example of emphasis on a keyword is in i. 85, where Achilles reassures Calchas, who is hesitating to tell what he knows, through fear of Agamemnon:

“θαρσήσας μάλα εἴπε || θεοπρόπιον ὅτι οἰσθα.”

The force of the emphasis upon *εἴπε* is as if he had said “Out with it!”

A great variety of emotions is conveyed through the medium of caesural emphasis. Sometimes the emphasis is of a contemptuous character, as in i. 111, where Agamemnon, angered at Calchas, tries to discredit the prophet’s explanation of the cause of Apollo’s wrath:

“καὶ νῦν ἐν Δαναοῖσι θεοπροπέων ἀγορεύεις,  
 ὡς δὴ τοῦδ’ ἐνεκά σφιν ἐκηβόλος ἀλγεα τεύχει,  
 οὐνεκ’ ἐγὼ κουρῆς || Χρυσηῖδος ἀγλά’ ἀποινα  
 οὐκ ἔθελον δέξασθαι . . . .”

“And now thou pratest, prophesying among the Danaoi, as if, forsooth, for this reason the Far-Darter wrought them woe, because I did not choose to accept the glorious ransom of a *mere maiden*, Chryses’ daughter . . . .”

Note the scornful emphasis upon *κουρῆς*.

Another example of contemptuous emphasis is in i. 574, where Hephaestus upbraids Zeus and Hera for quarreling about mere mortals:

“ἡ δὴ λοίγια ἔργα τάδ’ ἔσσεται οὐδ’ ἔτ’ ἀνεκτά,  
 εἰ δὴ σφὸν ἐνεκα θυητῶν || ἐριδαίνετον ὡδε.”

“Verily now baneful deeds these shall be, nor any longer tolerable if you two are going to strive thus about mere *mortals*.”

Compare the provoking tone of Hera to Zeus in i. 540, where she inquires of him about the visit of Thetis:

“τίς δὴ αὖ τοι, || δολομῆτα, || θεῶν συμφράσσατο βουλάς;”

“O *crafty one*, which of the gods has again been devising counsel with *thee*? ”

Note that we have in this case both the trithemimeral and the penthemimeral caesurae and that the word before each is emphatic.

The acerbity of the relations between Zeus and Hera is further illustrated by the emphasis which Zeus places upon the word *φησι* in i. 521, where he is trying to give Thetis a reason why he may not grant her request that he confer honor upon her son. Referring to Hera he says:

"ἢ δὲ καὶ αὔτως || μ' αὖτον || ἐν ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσιν  
νεκτεῖ, καὶ τὲ μέ φησι || μάχη Τρώεσσιν ἀρήγειν."

"But she, even as it *is*, is *forever* upbraiding me among the immortal gods, and what she *says* is that I help the Trojans in battle."

Often the emphasis is in the nature of sarcasm. So, in vi. 55-57, Agamemnon says to Menelaus, who is on the point of sparing the life of the Trojan Adrastus:

"ὦ πέπον, ὦ Μενέλαε, τί ἢ δὲ σὺ κήδεαι οὔτως  
ἀνδρῶν; ἢ σοι ἄριστα || πεπόνηται κατὰ οἴκον;"

"Oh you Menelaus! you mollycoddle, why do you care so much for the lives of men? Has the *best* of treatment been accorded your house by the Trojans?"

Again it is of a confirmatory character, as in xxiii. 103, where Achilles says with reference to the ghost of Patroclus, which has just appeared to him:

"ὦ ποποι, ἢ ρά τις ἔστι || καὶ εἰν Ἀΐδαο δόμοισιν  
ψυχὴ καὶ εἰδωλον, ἀτάρ φρένες οὐκ ἔνι πάμπαν."

"Ah me, so there really *is*, even in the house of Hades, a soul and phantom; but there is no substance to it at all."

Still again, caesural emphasis is sometimes in the nature of a refrain, as in Andromache's lament for Hector, in xxiv. 725-30. Note the repetition of the word ὄλεο . . . ὄλωλας, "perished . . . perished."

"ἄνερ, ἀτ' αἰῶνος νέος ὄλεο || καδ δέ με χήρην  
λείπεις ἐν μεγάροισι· πάις δ' ἔτι νήπιος αὔτως,  
ὅν τέκομεν σύ τ' ἔγώ τε δυσάμμοροι, οὐδέ μιν οἷω  
ἥβην ἔξεσθαι· πρὶν γὰρ πόλις ἥδε κατ' ἄκρης  
πέρσεται· ἢ γὰρ ὄλωλας || ἐπίσκοπος, ὃς τέ με αὐτὴν  
ῥύσκειν, ἔχεις δ' ἀλόχους κεδνὰς καὶ νήπια τέκνα."

"Husband, thou hast *perished* young out of life, and thou leavest me a widow in thy halls; and the child is still only an infant, to whom thou and I gave being—ah, hapless ones! Nor do I think that he will come to manhood; for before that, this city shall be utterly destroyed. In truth, thou hast *perished*, my protector, who didst shield me myself and all these our noble wives and helpless children."

While examples of caesural emphasis may be expected anywhere in Homer, they are much more frequent in dialogue portions than elsewhere. An examination of book i yields the following statistics: whole number of verses 611, divided thus: in plain narrative 180, in dialogue 431; instances of caesural emphasis in narrative 16, in dialogue 134; that is, about 9 per cent of the narrative lines to about 31 per cent of the dialogue lines exhibit noteworthy instances of caesural emphasis. A quiet descriptive passage like i. 430-87 (the story of the return of Chryseis to her father) contains almost no example. Even an animated battle-scene like xi. 67-209 contains hardly any examples. Notable instances are comparatively rare outside of speeches. But in speeches caesural emphasis is frequent and is important as giving the general tone of the passages involved.

Moreover, certain words are found with especial frequency at the caesural pause. For example, the word *ταῦτα* (in this form) occurs 79 times in the *Iliad*, and in 34 of these it stands just before the caesural pause; e.g., i. 295 (Achilles to Agamemnon):

"ἄλλοισιν δὴ ταῦτ' || ἐπιτέλλεο, μὴ γὰρ ἐμοί γε!"

Again, iii. 399 (Helen to Aphrodite):

"δαιμονίη, τί με ταῦτα || λιλαίει ἡπεροπείειν,"

The word *πάντες* (in this form) occurs 113 times in the *Iliad*, and in 42 of these is found at the caesural pause, e.g., i. 22-23:

ἐνθ' ἄλλοι μὲν πάντες || ἐπενφήμησαν Ἀχαιοί<sup>1</sup>  
αἰδεῖσθαι θ' ἵερη || καὶ ἀγλαὰ δέχθαι ἄποινα

The word *αὐτός* (in this form) occurs 155 times in the *Iliad*, 52 times at the caesural pause, e.g., i. 133:

"ἡ ἐθέλεις, || ὅφερ' αὐτός || ἔχεις γέρας αὐτὰρ ἐμ' αὐτῶς  
ἥσθαι δενόμενον, || κέλεαι δέ μ' τήνδ' ἀποδοῦναι,"

"Is that indeed thy desire, that thou mayest *thyself* keep thy prize, while I actually sit lacking one, and dost thou bid me give back this maid?"

The implication of an ulterior, dishonorable motive lies altogether in the word *aντός* and the scornful emphasis given it by its position at the caesura.

Caesural emphasis is found not infrequently in the Odyssey, occasionally in Hesiod, and also in the Homeric Hymns; e.g., Hymn to Hermes, 274-77 (where the infant Hermes protests to Apollo his innocence of cattle-stealing):

"εἰ δὲ θάλεις || πατρὸς κεφαλὴν || μέγαν ὄρκον ὁμοῦμαι·  
μὴ μὲν ἔγω μῆτ' αὐτὸς || ὑπίσχομαι αἴτιος ἔναι,  
μῆτε τιν' ἀλλον δπωπα || βοῶν κλοπὸν ὑμετεράων,  
αἴτινες αἱ βόες εἰσὶ· || τὸ δὲ κλέος οἰον ἀκούω."

"And if you *wish* it, I will swear a great oath by *my father's head* that neither do I admit that I *myself* am to blame, nor have I *seen* any other the stealer of your cattle, whatever cattle *are*: I've only heard the name."

Examples are found in the Elegiac poets also, e.g., Tyrtaeus viii. 15 (Bergk-Hiller<sup>1</sup>):

Ὥ νέοι, ἀλλὰ μάχεσθε || παρὸς ἀλλήλοισι μένορτε,  
μηδὲ φυγῆς αἰσχρῆς ἄρχετε μηδὲ φόβον.

The great field, however, is in the Tragic poets, where many and highly significant instances are to be found; but to treat these would exceed the limits of this paper. I will quote only one example, where Sophocles, that resolute defender of the authority of Apollo and the Delphic oracle, disposes, in one line, of the question of the guilt of Orestes—a question to which Aeschylus had devoted the whole play of the *Eumenides* and which was so to exercise Euripides in his *Electra*. Orestes, in the *Electra* of Sophocles, 1424, comes out with reeking sword, fresh from the killing of his own mother. Electra asks:

"'Ορέστα, πῶς κυρεῖτε;'"

"Orestes, how fare ye?"

to which he replies:

" . . . Τάν δόμουσι μὲν  
καλῶς, Ἀπόλλων || εἰ καλῶς ἐθέσπισεν."

"What's within is well, if *Apollo* spake well."

The entire trust in Apollo is the keynote of the passage, and this is brought out only by the highly significant emphasis on the word *'Απόλλων* at the caesural pause.

The question naturally arises, Did Vergil make use of caesural emphasis? Professor Seymour in the article referred to speaks of the caesura of Vergil as "a mechanical stencil-plate pause, without poetic effect—a pause in the sound merely, not in the sense" (p. 94). While I have not made any extensive study of Vergil from this point of view, and while Seymour is doubtless right in the main, I think we are justified in assuming caesural emphasis in certain spirited passages, like the following lines from Dido's accusation of Aeneas, *Aeneid* iv. 309-13:

"Quin etiam *hiberno* || moliris sidere classem,  
et mediis properas *aquilonibus* ire per altum,  
crudelis? Quid si non arva aliena domosque  
ignotas peteres, sed Troia antiqua maneret,  
Troia per *undosum* || peteretur classibus aequor?"

The way in which the poet bears down upon the related ideas of winter (*hiberno*), the storm-winds (*aquilonibus*), and the rough sea (*undosum*), is noteworthy.

In conclusion I may say that my attention was first directed to this subject by the constant reading aloud of Greek verse in the classroom, and that my experience as a teacher has convinced me that the interpretation of many a line of Homer and the dramatic poets is at once made clear to the student when it is read with proper observance of caesural emphasis. This is better than any amount of learned discussion of the passage. Let us try to make the poets interpret themselves, especially when they have taken such pains, through the very order of words, to leave us in no doubt as to where the emphasis should be placed.

## THE DIRECT METHOD IN LATIN TEACHING: A REPLY

BY EDWARD C. CHICKERING  
Jamaica High School, New York City

It is a fundamental principle of justice that no one shall be condemned without a thorough trial. On this ground I feel that a reply must be made to Professor Kirtland's article on the Direct Method, published in the *Classical Journal* for June, 1913.

Near the beginning of his paper he says: "I have been unable to find a single American school in which it [the direct method] has been used throughout even the first year of the school course." Is not that fact in itself sufficient reason why it should be given every possible opportunity to prove itself, that it may stand or fall according to the results? If Mr. Kirtland "holds radical views regarding the necessity of a reform in our teaching," and yet maintains that "at this critical time we cannot afford to try any experiments that may fail," where are we coming to anyway? The very nature of experiment involves liability to failure, and it is obvious that something must be done if Latin is to hold its place.

The tenets of the Direct Method are: (1) The thing, act, idea should be associated directly with the Latin expression, not with an English translation of it. (2) The forms and syntax should be taught by use, inductively, not as abstract phenomena to be applied later to the language itself. (3) Understanding must come before translation, which is in the later years a valuable exercise but not the ultimate aim. (4) Oral handling of the work, being more flexible, should precede writing.

Let us see how Professor Kirtland has handled these points. He says: "We may safely adopt all that goes with the direct method except its directness." In other words, he rejects almost *in toto* the first principle. His references to this feature of the matter are rather indefinite. He says: "I cannot be persuaded that the average student can be brought to think in Latin, as it is called, without an enormous and unprofitable expenditure of time." Of course we

agree that "thinking in Latin" simply means that an idea suggests a Latin expression rather than an English expression. Naturally this is possible only in so far as the Latin expressions have been made familiar: to this degree I have the testimony of many of my pupils, now in their second or third half-year of the subject, that gradually they are coming to find the Latin uppermost in their minds, and that the English words do not come first. Indeed, it would be passing strange if it were otherwise, as in the class the pupils hear Latin almost exclusively and in its interpretation the English language is almost entirely avoided. This being true, it means that our pupils are learning Latin as Latin, not as a strange language having no meaning except as it is interpreted through the vernacular. A feature of this direct appeal is that not only the eyes and hands of the pupils are employed, but also their ears and their tongues. It therefore follows that the center of our interest and of our teaching is no longer the subject, but the child, whose fullest development is thus brought about.

On the second principle Mr. Kirtland says: "I do not for one moment suppose that the highest knowledge of a language consists in familiarity with the grammatical categories in which its usages are classified. . . . I am concerned only with the pedagogical problem." I believe we have met the objection indicated here—the trouble with the pedagogical problem—by the device of the paradigm- and syntax-sentences. The forms are learned, and accurately learned; but only in sentences, where they have in every case a meaning of their own; only in the order in which such usages can be logically developed; never as a mass of meaningless material, to be clothed later on—often much later on—with a set of abstract rules to explain their use.

When we consider the matter of translation, which must include turning English into Latin as well as Latin into English, there comes a distinct parting of the ways. "I do not for one moment suppose that the highest knowledge of a language," says Professor Kirtland, "has any inherent and necessary connection with translation." He speaks of translation, however, as "agreed until just now [to be] the chief justification of the place of Latin in the schools," and quotes Professor Bennett: "Mastery over the resources of one's

mother tongue . . . . comes as the direct and necessary result of careful translation." I do not deny the great value of translation, but I do deny its value as it is ordinarily done, even when the conventional method is almost ideally successful in accomplishing its specific purpose. The mere struggle with sentences and phrases and terms, back of which there is no clear idea, can only result at best, even if done with entire honesty, in a patchwork of ideas, presenting individual expressions which have been learned as usable equivalents of the Latin. That the task in the earlier years, if conscientiously performed, is for most pupils a matter of extreme difficulty, cannot be denied. When, however, translation means searching for the most fitting English phrase to embody the idea and parallel the style of the Latin, then the pupil has before him an exercise of greatest value for his logical and linguistic faculties, and he is well on his way to an adequate appreciation of his authors—but not until such immediate comprehension is his. Pupils approaching Latin this way will not regard it as an unnatural, artificial mass of words, making miserable English if translated as it stands, and unjustifiably free translation if put into good English. As for translation into Latin, the Direct Method leaves no need of it in the earlier years; later it is valuable just as is Latin-English translation.

Oral handling of the work Mr. Kirtland justifies, and "even Latin conversation, so far as it does not add to the student's burden." Certainly conversation is anything but an end in the method. In so far as oral question and answer make alive, and, by preceding writing, tend to obviate the fixing of errors in the pupils' minds, they are valuable. Beyond that, of course Latin must be the language of the classroom, this being an essential support of the directness of teaching and understanding.

So much for the tenets of the Direct Method, and Professor Kirtland's views upon them. There are also a few general observations in his paper upon which I should like to say a word. "None of them [advocates of the Direct Method] has explained how it came to be abandoned." We are not trying to bring a dead horse to life. When Latin ceased to be used as a living tongue, only the dry bones of formalistic teaching remained. The obvious need of

ability to speak Latin being removed, the whole substance of the prevailing methods was swept away, and what remained was believed to have value partly because it was hard and partly because it was disagreeable. We now believe that certain characteristics of that old teaching were good, and can be applied now. We should not go back to them altogether, any more than we should again advocate the learning by heart of the grammar from cover to cover.

As concerns the method for modern languages, Mr. Kirtland says: "The newer ways of teaching the modern languages have started with the assumption that the methods used in teaching the classics were not valid for living tongues belonging to our own civilization. Then it has not yet been established that the Direct Method is the best way of teaching American boys and girls the modern languages." And later, "As to speaking, how many of our teachers of French and German can do that fluently and correctly in the language which they teach?" The modern-language teachers adopted the methods of classical teachers because they had no methods of their own, and few teachers were well prepared. They are now making methods of their own, with well-equipped teachers. That the Direct Method is rapidly becoming the accepted method with them, and that it is no longer on trial, is clearly shown in Professor Handschin's recent report to the United States Commissioner of Education. The teachers of Latin are not aping them, but are working out their problems carefully in their own way; that they do coincide in important particulars is not surprising. As regards ability to speak the modern language taught, it will hardly be denied that the deplorable condition to which Professor Kirtland refers is rapidly being done away.

"Mr. Jones can say: ' . . . [ancient] literature cannot be thoroughly appreciated by anybody, unless he can speak, and apprehend when spoken, the ancient language.'" Mr. Kirtland takes direct issue with this. But Mr. Jones's statement applies to a field much wider than that composed of boys and girls studying Latin by the direct method. If we insist on "thoroughly appreciated" we must limit our consideration to men of scholarship. I have little question that the great commentators could speak Greek and Latin with great ease. Mr. Jones would put our pupils

in that respect at least in the same favorable position toward the classics that the great scholars occupied. But the scholars' ability does not prove that they did not acquire that power in spite of the way they were taught the classics. Familiar are the instances of college presidents, surprised by an address in Latin, who replied extemporaneously in the same tongue. I recall being told myself by one of the greatest teachers who ever held a chair in Mr. Kirtland's own school of his experience in the use of spoken Latin many years ago in Italy, when he knew no Italian and his chance acquaintance knew no English. Professor Cilley was probably never taught to talk Latin, but his was a scholarly mind, and he knew the language. Professor Kirtland could without doubt talk Latin easily if he tried.

As regards practical obstacles to a general adoption of the method, many of them would at once disappear upon the method's becoming general. If pupils were transferred from one school to another, those taught by the old methods would then suffer, not the others. Examinations set to test ability in the new direction would simply undo pupils taught in the old. If we could not get a smattering of a great deal, we could at least get a thorough knowledge of less; and I believe in the end we should cover much more ground. In my own experience I have not found the methods too puerile for boys and girls just entering the high school; reluctance on their part to speak in a foreign tongue has gradually disappeared as they gained confidence; even classes of forty I have found possible, although of course by no means desirable for any method. And while such a plan must doubtless be tried first by the teachers who have the best training, I have seen the teaching itself such an inspiration to those whose specific knowledge perhaps was less that they have grown in scholarship and ability by leaps and bounds. Of course it would be madness to let every Latin teacher in the country try the Direct Method all at once, unguided. But there are many who have the equipment to do it now, and as soon as it has justified itself the means for training the younger generation of instructors will be found in abundant measure.

Professor Kirtland agrees that something must be done. Let him, then, and others who do not feel that they are in a position to

make the experiments, wait until the methods have had a thorough test in America. We are firmly convinced that the direct approach, given a fair trial, will solve the problem. Teachers can no longer sit back and "hear lessons"; the pupil is demanding his own, and will receive it; and the teacher must adjust himself accordingly. I have the utmost faith in the scholarly conscience of my colleagues, among whom I am glad to number Mr. Kirtland, that they will hold an open mind until they are convinced; and that they will ultimately be convinced I am equally sure.

## THE AMERICAN ACADEMY IN ROME AND CLASSICAL STUDIES IN AMERICA

BY ALBERT W. VAN BUREN  
Librarian of the American Academy in Rome

I presume that the name of the American School of Classical Studies in Rome is more or less familiar to the majority of the readers of the *Classical Journal*. Many of them have heard reports of the institution from those who knew of it at first hand; a considerable number have been associated with teachers who have studied there; and over two hundred have themselves been enrolled as members at some time or other in the eighteen years of the School's existence. They do not need to be informed that this institution, since its opening in 1895, has occupied a unique place in the general economy of American education, being correlated with the schools at Athens and Jerusalem, as regards general character and scope, but differentiated from them by as much as Rome and what Rome signifies is different from Athens and Jerusalem.<sup>1</sup> Most of my readers have also heard of the recent union of the School with the American Academy in Rome, an advanced school for architects and artists, and if they are of a precise and inquiring turn of mind they know that the old Classical School and the old Academy are now the two component parts of the new institution, the united American Academy in Rome. The

<sup>1</sup> The scope of the Classical School has always been broader than the word "classical" in its title might seem to imply. Early Christian, mediaeval, and Renaissance studies have been included from the first, and the history of modern Italy is now recognized. I presume that my favorite definition, when I am asked what is the scope of the Library, would apply equally well to the School: "that it includes everything that has to do with the history of human life in Italy from the earliest times, and also with the history of human life in other countries in so far as that may be expected to throw light on Italian civilization either as influencing it or as being influenced by it." This, like all good definitions which are intended as guides for conduct, has the advantage of containing several elements which are susceptible of various interpretations as circumstances may demand. To take a specific instance, if it should prove that we shall have to study Hittite culture in order to understand the Etruscans, then Hittite studies can properly occupy our attention in Rome and can have a section provided for them in the Library.

former American School of Classical Studies in Rome is now the School of Classical Studies of the American Academy in Rome.

I doubt, however, if the average reader of these pages has a clear and definite idea of the exact nature of these recent developments, and of what they mean to him personally as a teacher or student of the classics. And I feel it my duty and privilege, as being both in touch with classical education in America and perhaps to an exceptional degree familiar with conditions in Rome, to avail myself of the opportunity afforded by the pages of the *Classical Journal*, for presenting a brief but definite statement of what has happened in the past two years and what may reasonably be expected to happen in the future. It will of course be understood that such opinions as may be expressed in the course of this article are no more than my personal opinions, for which the responsibility rests with me alone. The facts I shall endeavor to state as accurately as possible.

It is difficult for those of us who know Rome and know the site of the new American Academy on the Janiculum to express ourselves on the subject without some show of enthusiasm. I know that the scholars whom it has been my privilege the past year to guide to the *belvedere* of the Villa Aurelia, the highest point within the ancient circuit of the city's walls, and who felt the sudden apparition of all Rome and most of Latium spread out at their feet, bathed in the rich colors of a Roman afternoon, framed in by the noble outline of the Alban Mount and the stern barrier of the gray Sabines and the solitary crag of Soracte, with perhaps, if the day is waning and you know just where to look on the western horizon, the far-distant gleam of sunlit sea—I am sure that these scholars, whom I have seen speechless with emotion when confronted with what to the student of western civilization is the most momentous landscape in existence and to the soul with eye for beauty certainly one of the most inspiring, will agree with me that for a discussion of the real estate of the American Academy in Rome the Pedestrian Muse is less well adapted than the measures in which Horace immortalized Soracte, or in which Martial sang:

Hinc septem dominos videre montis  
Et totam licet aestimare Romam,  
Albanos quoque Tusculosque colles. . . .

But the reader would prefer to await the time of his own Roman experiences, and then to enjoy these things for himself. What he wishes now, and what it is my purpose to give him, is an unemotional, business-like statement of what, by reason of recent developments, the Classical School in Rome is able to offer him. He wishes to know, first, what has taken place? Second, what is the new material equipment of the institution? And third, what are the facilities for research and study which are to be offered?

First, as to the change which has occurred in the status of the Classical School. This is not the place for me to speak of what the recollections of the former school mean to a few of us "old-timers." Suffice it to say that for the space of eighteen years the old Classical School has represented American scholarship in a dignified manner in this cosmopolitan community; has assisted according to its ability in the advancement of historical science; and through its alumni has exercised a salutary influence on education in America. While as individuals we are conscious of our own shortcomings, still as concerns the School itself there is a feeling of honest satisfaction in the record.

But it has never been a large institution, and in various ways those who were most familiar with it knew that its potentialities were far from being fully realized. In particular, on the material side, we saw that the hired house at 5 Via Vicenza, which for a term of years has served as a dignified and comfortable residence for the School, and the leaving of which, to tell the truth, will have in it a touch of sadness, would within measurable time prove inadequate for our needs; and on the intellectual, or perhaps I should say the spiritual, side we felt the pity of it, that we whose business it was in large part to interpret the remains of the artistic activity of other times, while living in the same city with a community of productive American artists, should not be thrown more intimately into contact with them and with their work; we knew we had much to learn from them, and we might hope to be able to give them something in return. And as to the actual membership of the Classical School, it always has been a source of keen regret that we seemed unable to reach the great mass of American classical teachers, whose school curriculum tied them down in the cities of their residence throughout the only part of the year when, under the old

order of things, it was humanly possible to keep the School open. We had thought of a summer session, but in a small house, with a faculty whose time throughout the year was all too fully accounted for as it was, and with very limited financial resources, such a project was obviously out of the question.

Under the new organization, the School is one of the two component parts of a very strong institution; instead of living in a hired house it occupies permanent quarters, in which all has been done that the best architectural skill of America and Italy could do to meet its ideal requirements both for the immediate present and, as far as we can see, for a long future. Its Fellows will have constant opportunity for association with their friends of the School of Fine Arts. Its library is now the library of the united Academy, and as such its friends may expect to see it develop from now on as never before. And the establishment of a central administration for the affairs of the united institution relieves the classical faculty of a large part of the miscellaneous demands upon its time and energy which, though never complained of, and seldom realized by outsiders, still tended to cripple it in the pursuit of its scholarly work, reminding one sometimes of the plight of the old Temple-builders, who with one hand held the sword and with the other carried the stones with which to build the Lord's house.

Secondly, what is now the material equipment of the Classical School in the new Academy? It will derive its full share of benefit from the administration building, the Villa Aurelia, with its sixteenth-century wing built on the Aurelian Wall, and its formal Italian gardens that would have brought joy to the heart of a Pliny, and its Garibaldine memories, and its incomparable view of Rome. Its library,<sup>1</sup> now the common possession of artists and historians alike, in the eyes of the law, as it always has been for practical purposes in the eyes of its administrators, is adequately

<sup>1</sup> It is a good library, for the field which it covers. I have endeavored to put on record the fascinating history of its early years, and to state its condition at the time of writing, in my report which was published in the *Bulletin of the Archaeological Institute of America*, III (1911-12), 234-45, to which I may refer for details. Since that report was prepared, there have been three developments of importance in the Library: First, it has received the collection of art works which had belonged to Mr. Francis D. Millet, the distinguished artist who was long associated with the Academy in various important capacities, and whose heroic death on the "Titanic" is still fresh in the minds of all. Secondly, through the action of a number of editors of American

housed, with provision for the expansion of the next thirty years at least. Its museum has a specially designed room provided for it. One of the two faculty houses is at its disposal. For the ideal scheme of twelve Fellows (including students of both the ancient and the later periods of history), comfortable housing is assured, and individual studies are provided communicating with the main library room. And—perhaps the most important feature of all—the scale of the new buildings and in general the size of the new institution are such that it will now be possible, beginning in 1915, to have a summer session for teachers, lasting from about July 1 to August 12, with room for several hundred members, at a time of year when relief from their professional duties in America will permit them to come to Rome.

I find that in giving the answer to the question: "What is now the material equipment of the Classical School in the new Academy?" I have practically answered the third question as well: "What are the facilities for research and study which are to be offered?" And I think there is not much for me to add. The Classical School will go on doing what it has been trying to do these past eighteen years, but doing it with better equipment, and we may hope doing it better. It will not do it with a clearer vision or greater hope or more true devotion than the men to whom the inception of the School and the conduct of its affairs in those first years of small things were due; their successors will do well if, in the face of larger opportunities and with more equipment, they carry out the ideals of the institution with the wisdom and zeal and devotion of the founders.

The following paragraph may serve to correct a misconception in the minds of some readers:

One of the features of the Classical School in the past has been its co-operation with the women's colleges and the coeducational

art and architectural magazines, in presenting the copies of their periodicals, the Library is tending still more to become the central depot in Europe where scholars will come to consult American publications. And thirdly, the generous action of Miss Eleanor de Gr. Cuyler, in establishing in memory of her brother, Mr. Cornelius C. Cuyler, who for many years was treasurer of the Classical School, two alcoves devoted to the subject of ancient art in all its manifestations, makes it highly probable that in the course of a few years we shall have in this particular field not merely one of the best working libraries in the Mediterranean basin—we have that already—but one of the half-dozen best consulting libraries in the world.

universities of America in the matter of admitting women to its privileges. There is no reason to suppose that this tradition will be modified in the future. Women play a large and important part in the educational and scholarly life of America, and the American Academy in Rome, as being virtually a national institution, recognizes this fact and its own obligation to conform to it. The Academy is for the present obliged to limit its dormitory accommodations to the men Fellows; but this is the only respect in which a woman who would have been admitted on equal terms with men in the old Classical School will find herself at a disadvantage. It is not that the women are less fortunate than before, but that the men are more fortunate. And when the ideal of the director of the Academy is realized, looking toward a dormitory for women, then that sole form of discrimination will cease.

I trust that this brief account of the classical side of the new institution will not leave the reader with the impression that the years of wandering in the wilderness are over and the Promised Land has been reached. The opportunity is indeed great, and the inspiration is great. But there is much still to be accomplished, much hard work and much sacrifice, before we can afford to view things with complaisance—if indeed we ever reach that state of dubious happiness. There is much work, scholarly and otherwise, for those in Rome, before the Classical School will have fully adapted itself to its greater environment. There is much to be done, and by many people, before the institution will be in such a financial position that it can adequately respond to its great opportunities. There is much to be done in enlisting the sympathetic co-operation of scholars and academic communities throughout the United States. And there is much of the best sort of missionary work to be done by the reader of this article, in spreading among those of his acquaintance whom the American Academy in Rome needs, and who need the American Academy in Rome, the knowledge of the institution which is waiting for them on the Janiculum.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Full information concerning the American Academy in Rome will be found in the *Annual Report* for the year 1912, copies of which may be obtained by writing to Mr. C. Grant La Farge, Secretary of the American Academy in Rome, 101 Park Ave., New York City.

## Book Reviews

*Ancient Gems in Modern Settings.* Being Versions of the Greek Anthology in English Rhyme by Various Writers. Edited by G. B. Grundy. Oxford: B. H. Blackwell, 1913.

The Greek epigram is a constant lure to the versifier, less often to the poet. The simple dignity and directness of early epigram baffle the translator; the "modern setting" is apt to be tawdry, and the "ancient gem" becomes mere gaud. To one who knows the Greek, the jingle of English rhyme is offensive, though necessary to the enjoyment of the English reader, and perhaps fairly matched by the abundant assonance at least of later epigrams. When "Cyrene" must rhyme with "mean ye," and "high rate" with "pirate," one naturally prefers the rhymeless original. Mr. Grundy, however, has succeeded in bringing together translations of a fairly even degree of merit, better than the collection by Tomson in 1889 and more representative of the best epigrams in the anthology and of the best translators. Real distinction in style is rare; Symonds and Lang approach it occasionally; of those who have attempted much, J. A. Potts is more evenly excellent than the others.

Editors of anthologies never expect praise; they must select, and under the limitations of copyright and of the favor of individual translators; nor can they hope that their taste in selection will agree with that of many readers. The reviewer becomes querulous when he finds Theocritus represented by one epigram as against twenty epigrams of Leonidas; Phillimore's translations in the *Dublin Review* and Paton's in his *Erotica*, though both these translators are hardly more than poetasters, might have been drawn upon to enlarge the contribution from the Hellenistic period. One misses Edmund Gosse's "After many a dusty mile," and wonders if the English editor might not have made a place for a few American versions, those for example of Lilla Cabot Perry. The editor is quite within his rights in including so large a number of his own translations, to which he modestly refers in his preface; his jocose Muse is airy successful in the translation of Nicarchus' difficult ascent to the heavenly home of Demetrius in a six-story flat-building; nor are his versions of less flippant epigrams fairly represented by the dreadful lapse in Ben Jonson's lyric:

I am not fond of wine, dear, but if you'd have me sip  
The flowing bowl too often, just touch it with your lip.  
For if you touch it thus, love, sobriety's all up;  
How can a man resist so sweet a bearer of the cup?

Mr. Grundy runs a bit to commonplaces like "the flowing bowl," but it is not often that his poetic taste is "all up."

H. W. P.

*The Message of Greek Art.* By H. H. Powers. New York: Macmillan, 1913. Pp. 336. \$2.00.

This book is sure of success. It is a product of long and ardent acquaintance with the works of Greek art. It is thoughtful, impassioned, compelling. It will open the eyes and stir the hearts of many readers. "Now at last," they will say, "an inspired prophet has revealed to us the essential beauty and significance of Greek art." Is not that praise enough?

In the first page of his Introduction Dr. Powers defines the "message of Greek art" as being "what it has to tell us of the Greeks, of their personality, their ideals, and their experiences." This gives us the keynote of the book. Of the difficult problems of evidence which underlie the whole subject hardly a suggestion is conveyed. Very little is said of technical processes, not much of the slowly developing mastery of anatomy, pose and drapery, not much of line, mass, and composition. The emphasis is everywhere laid upon spiritual content; this is the real "message."

Very well. But to interpret that spiritual content is not easy. Great is the danger of mistaking fancy for fact. Unless the master has had an arduous discipline, his docile disciples will be led astray.

Of the too common minor errors of fact in this book I will make nothing. But here are a few points which Dr. Powers will not consider unimportant. In the discussion of the Greek use of color upon marble sculpture we are told (p. 69) that Greek aesthetic instincts gradually overcame this practice, until "in works of the Roman period . . . color has practically disappeared." This is a complete mistake. No such change took place, and it is *not* "to the Greek that we owe our instinctive protest against his earlier practice." Chap. vii contains a vigorous discussion of the nude in art. The predilection of Greek sculpture for the nude male figure is explained. But, according to Dr. Powers, in the most glorious period, i.e., the fifth century, "the female nude was unknown" (pp. 107-8). What about the Ludovisi "Throne"? What about the Niobid of the Banca Commerciale? What about the Helen of Zeuxis? The truth is that while sculpture, largely restricted to religious uses, seldom in the fifth century represented the nude female figure, the sister art of painting, more emancipated, was already familiar with this theme. If we are seeking to understand Greek "ideals and experiences," we have no right to narrow our vision to a single phase of their art. Again, "let us draw the curtain before the orgies of Roman nude art." Why this fling? According to our standards of decorum Roman monumental sculpture is more decorous than Greek. And as for the baser things, no Roman "orgies" need a curtain more than do many of the Attic vase-paintings of the best period.

It is tempting to go farther and to puncture one or two ideas advanced in the eloquent account of the Attic grave-reliefs (chap. xiii). But enough. The fact remains that many who could not be tempted by a sounder book will be captivated by these glowing pages. If the author exhibits no penetrating con-

noisseurship, his enthusiasms are generally for the best things. To bring many into the presence of the best things is a great achievement.

F. B. TARBELL

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

*Euripides, seine Dichtung und seine Persönlichkeit.* Von HUGO STEIGER. Heft V, *Das Erbe der Alten.* Leipzig: Dietrich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1912. Pp. vi+124. M. 3.50.

The criticism of Euripides perhaps more than that of any other Greek author has time out of mind suffered from an excess of subjectivism. Given a certain point of view on the part of a critic, and his reactions can be foreseen with the certainty which attends the prediction of eclipses. Between the transcendental methods of Wilamowitz, the plausible impossibilities of Verrall, the erudite harmonizations of Nestle, the dextrous romanticizing of Murray, to mention types of the more recent critiques only, the *via media* is none too often struck or consistently traveled. For the problem of Euripidean criticism is essentially to account for, if not to harmonize, his conflicting purposes. Rarely has there been a man of letters less at one with himself; witness his relentless iconoclasm, and his moral inspiration, the streams of ravishing, transcendental poetry, and the wastes of sarcastic, logic-chopping prose. Now these contrasts are not to be interpreted away by romanticizing the prosaic, or by rationalizing the poetical, or by reducing both to a level of consistent "enlightenment"; but, as Steiger insists, they must be recognized as the expression of a personality at war with itself. Euripides' plays were not written merely to win prizes, nor did they fall from heaven solely to enable critics to test the principles of dramatic art (p. 6). Their author was a great poet, but perhaps an even greater moral judge; it was the tragedy of his life to be compelled so often to sacrifice before his ethical postulates the very essence of the myth which as poet he was to glorify.

In attempting to grasp this personality of the poet, Steiger was led to Ibsen. Much of Ibsen-criticism he found could be applied directly to Euripides, and many passages of the Norwegian's letters and poems he felt to be exactly what Euripides *might* have said of himself. This likeness is so obvious that it had not passed unobserved. Nestle, Wilamowitz, and Woerner had called attention to it, but Steiger elaborates the comparison and succeeds thereby in throwing not a few rays of light upon Euripides' work regarded as the expression of a singular personality. Of the many significant parallels the following are perhaps the most important: Both were inspired by the "genius of uprightness"; were fanatics of reality, never wavering between "sweet lies and bitter truth"; were apostles of an uncompromising morality, by which standard alone they passed judgment, and in whose interest they not infrequently sacrificed dramatic values; in short, practically every play of both Greek and Norwegian is best understood as an ethical *Tendenzschrift*.

The introductory remarks on the general spirit of the work of Euripides, as contrasted with that of his predecessors, are excellent but incapable of brief summary. The several succeeding chapters treat the extant plays (the fragments are wisely excluded) by groups in the light of the general principles of criticism adopted. Without attempting a catalogue of his criticisms, I shall undertake in a mere phrase or so to indicate those points of view which for especial interest or novelty seem to deserve mention even in this brief space. Thus the *Orestes* is intended as a *reductio ad absurdum* of the old myth after the *Iphigenia in Tauris* had offered a new and ethically satisfactory solution. The *Phoenissae* is conceived in the spirit of revolt against the tragedy of fate as typified in the *Septem*. The *Herakles* is the triumph of patient humanity over the wanton wickedness of a deity. The *Troades* is a *Tendenzschrift* to warn against the Sicilian expedition by depicting all the horrors of war, the material ruin of the vanquished, the moral degradation of the victors—a sort of Last Judgment panorama (Dieterich). This view which had been presented in an earlier paper is defended in a long note against the criticisms of Wilamowitz. The *Helena* is regarded as an extended parody of the old mythology, especially of the plot of the *Odyssey*, a spectacle upon which one may have gazed either with merriment or with moral indignation. This general position, though plausibly put, I find least convincing. The *Cyclops* is a burlesque on the Superman of the Sophists. The *Rhesus*, if not by Euripides himself, is at least Euripidean in tone. Its author had evidently read the *Doloneia* with righteous indignation. The discussion of this play goes far toward establishing its genuineness. It might be noted in passing that a historical illusion in the play would seem to date it in the early years of the Peloponnesian War (cf. *Philologus*, 67, p. 446). The *Ion* is a protest against any *Herrenmoral*. Finally Steiger vigorously rejects the palinode theory for the *Bacchae*. He points out the serious criticisms of the moral of the play which the poet allows himself, and makes his case all the stronger by not claiming a fairly diabolical hyper-refinement of destructive criticism after the manner of Verrall's latest book. And yet the presence of a certain note of yearning for peace and contentment in the midst of the world cannot be gainsaid. "Short is life and he who pursues a lofty goal loses thereby the day's joy" (Steiger's paraphrase of vss. 397 ff.). If this be the real meaning of the play it corresponds remarkably well with the spirit of resignation shown in Ibsen's last drama, *When We Dead Awaken*. It is the same weariness which Mr. Dowden finds in the closing epoch of Shakespeare's work.

The book is charmingly written, in a lucid style and with that mastery of material which allows artistic treatment. The Introduction and the last chapter are singularly fine bits of criticism, and well worth reading, quite apart from their philological interest. The point of view is adequately, though not exhaustively, set forth. Readers of Euripides should be stimulated to apply it further and in greater detail for themselves. It is noteworthy that Dieterich (in the admirable article "Euripides," *Pauly-Wissowa*, VI)

has been greatly influenced by certain earlier papers of Steiger's in which the latter's main positions had been presented, and in part applied in the criticism of certain plays.

The typography is excellent. Only two really confusing misprints have caught my eye: Hekabe for Hekate on p. 81, and 183 for 1383 in note 2, p. 115.

W. A. OLDFATHER

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

---

*Grammatica militans. Erfahrungen und Wünsche im Gebiete des lateinischen und griechischen Unterrichtes.* Von PAUL CAUER. Dritte, umgearbeitete und stark vermehrte Auflage. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1912. Pp. xii+227. M. 5.

That the study of Latin and Greek grammar—even in its departure from the normal—can be made fascinating to both teacher and student had been already shown by Dr. Cauer; and in this third edition of the *Grammatica militans*, appearing nine years after the second edition, he presents the subject in yet broader scope. We are accustomed to look to antiquity with reverence for its great works and great men, its poems, statues, philosophy, and political institutions; we seek illumination from them. Equally well, as Dr. Cauer maintains, the study of the *development* of the ancient languages is a great educative force for the youth of today and a mighty means of intellectual culture. He speaks not as a theorist, but out of a long and rich experience. The Greek language especially, which, as studied by our youths, covers the range of time from Homer to Attic Greek, offers an unexcelled field for observing the development and growth of language.

The book is intended for the teacher of Latin and Greek. It presents the fruits of modern linguistic studies, particularly from the historical standpoint. It is not difficult to understand and is replete with quotations from Greek and Latin. Furthermore, an inspiring and practical teacher shows what facts from the store of modern learning he himself has found useful in his classes; what simple facts of historical grammar should be imparted to the beginner, and what can be more profitably learned later in the course. Reviews of grammar, as the student grows in mind and experience, are not drudgery, but a means to intellectual awakening, if conducted in the manner indicated by Dr. Cauer.

In this brief notice it is impossible to do justice to the author's invaluable suggestions and convincing arguments. The book must be read to be appreciated. The chapters deal with: i, "Grammatische Terminologie," a discussion of the technical terms of grammar and of the preferable ones where a choice is offered; ii, "Induktion und Deduktion," a discussion of the inductive and deductive methods; each has its place, but the inductive method is not suited to the first steps; iii, "Analyse und Synthese," defined and illustrated as means of arriving at an author's thought, with many examples from Latin and Greek;

iv, "Logik und Psychologie," particularly their influence on the syntax of language; v, "Historische Grammatik," an exceedingly valuable view of the subject and a discussion of its place in elementary instruction; vi, "Zur Kasuslehre," containing many suggestions on the teaching of the cases, with a number of well-chosen examples, as usual; vii, "Genus verbi," a new chapter in this third edition of the book, dealing with the voices and containing an analysis of the meanings of the middle voice of the Greek verb; here, too, is traced the connection between the middle and the later passive; viii, "Tempora," a discussion of the tenses in Latin and Greek—for the teacher, one of the most important chapters of the book; ix, "Modi," a clear exposition of a difficult and complicated subject, adapted to the Latin and Greek read in the elementary course; x, "Hauptsatz und Nebensatz," on the development of the complex sentence by the parataxis of simple sentences; xi, "Bedingungssätze," on the origin of conditional periods, with a clear analysis of types of conditions in Latin and Greek. In conclusion, a brief chapter on "Wissenschaft und Praxis" is followed by several pages of notes and an ample index.

ALLEN R. BENNER

PHILLIPS ACADEMY  
ANDOVER, MASS.

*Aristotle on the Art of Poetry.* Edited by LANE COOPER. Boston: Ginn & Co., 1913. Pp. 29+101. \$0.80.

*Aristotle on the Art of Poetry*, an amplified version by Professor Lane Cooper of Cornell, aims to make the fundamental work on the drama intelligible, not only to Greek scholars, but to the average student of the drama who desires to get at those fundamental principles which have guided dramatists of all times. The *Poetics* of Aristotle has been the authority from which Dryden, Corneille, Ben Jonson, and others have derived their dramatic faith. They felt that not one of the principles could be defied and that there could not be others laid down. There have necessarily been changes in two thousand years: Shakespeare defied Aristotelian rule constantly, but the wonder still remains that in every drama of the present day, the points which Aristotle picked out as essential to the drama are to be found.

*Aristotle on the Art of Poetry* is not easy reading for anyone who is not intensely interested in the drama, and the difficulty which the teacher has in assigning this treatise to a class in the drama is that the illustrations which Aristotle took to make clear his contentions were naturally from the drama with which he was familiar, and the characters referred to are not familiar to an ordinary class in the modern drama or in the drama of Elizabeth's reign. Professor Cooper has kept the old illustrations, but has given modern instances as well, with the result that there is a refreshing sense of the truth and the modern aptness of what might be called our dramatic constitution. Aristotle's principles are capable of far wider application than one would imagine from

reading merely the illustrations taken from Greek literature. Professor Cooper apologizes for supplying these modern examples; they might with profit have been more extended—for example, the excellent modern illustrations of what Aristotle called the Reversal or *Peripatia*.

One of the best portions of Professor Cooper's book is his dealing with the meaning of the Greek *Catharsis*, which has always been more or less of a stumbling-block to students of the drama. It is wisely suggested by Mr. Cooper that a true realization of the feeling could be obtained by watching one's emotions carefully as one reads *Oedipus the King* or Shakespeare's *Othello*, and these illustrations are worth quoting:

I gaze and grieve, still cherishing my griefs;  
At times, e'en bitter tears yield sweet relief.

Also the lines from Wordsworth, whom one does not associate with this subject:

Pleasing was the smart  
And the tear precious in compassion shed;

and Coolidge, in *Love*:

She wept with pity and delight.

Again Mr. Cooper makes clear what Aristotle means when he says: "Poetry therefore, is something more philosophic and of a higher seriousness than History; for Poetry tends rather to express what is universal, whereas *History* relates particular events as such."

The edition of Aristotle's *Poetics* by Mr. Cooper is intended principally for students of the drama. The discussion of the definition of a Tragedy, the description of the ideal tragic plot, and the discussion of the qualities of tragic character are well intended for the drama student rather than for the student of poetry in general; and for classes which are engaged in studying the drama, either in its general development, or in its particular phases, such as the Elizabethan drama or the modern English drama, Professor Cooper's book is earnestly recommended.

LEWIS PERRY

WILLIAMS COLLEGE

---

*Stories of Old Greece and Rome.* By EMILIE KIP BAKER. New York:  
Macmillan, 1913. Pp. xii+382. \$1.50.

This book contains no preface or introductory note of any kind, from which one may gather the author's purpose in writing it or the class of readers to whom it is directed. But the stories of the Greek mythology are told in their simplest form, and are apparently addressed to young readers. They are well told and contain all the more important stories. The book should make a valuable addition to the library of the teacher of mythology in elementary and high schools.

A short appendix gives additional information concerning the mythological heroes and heroines, relating more especially to their impression upon Greek and Roman art and religious cults, and giving some data as to the influence of these stories upon English poetry. The matter of the appendix, which to older readers is, of course, the more important matter, is disappointing, being incoherent and fragmentary. To the younger readers, for whom the stories are evidently intended, the matter of the appendix, even in its present form, would make no special appeal.

A good index makes reference to the mythological characters and stories easy.

F. J. M.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

*Virgil's Aeneid, Books i-vi.* With Introduction, Notes, and Vocabulary. Edited by P. F. O'BRIEN. New York: Schwartz, Kirwin & Fauss, 1913. Pp. ciii+316+110.

It is a dull year that does not produce a new edition of the *Aeneid* for use of high-school pupils. The present edition has the usual features of introduction, text (Books i-vi), notes, and vocabulary. Among the many excellent editions already in use, a new edition has little chance for distinction. The volume is very attractive, however, handsomely made, with excellent illustrations and map. The introduction contains a life of the poet, a thoughtful discussion of the poem itself, of the influence of Virgil, his literary indebtedness, a condensed epitome of the whole story of the *Aeneid*, by books, some hints for translating, and for the reading of the Latin lines, a discussion of the supernatural in the *Aeneid*. The introduction ends with a presentation of points of prosody, metrical licenses used by Virgil, points of syntax, and syntactical and rhetorical figures, and word-order.

At the end of the text of each book is a metrical index, giving the metrical peculiarities of that book. The editor has employed a dotted system in his text by which all vowels which are long by nature are marked with a dot placed above the vowel.

The book has honestly done its part, for it provides abundant material for the profitable and successful study of Virgil; but, as in the case of all other editions, this success will depend vastly more upon the teacher than upon any textbook which he may use.

F. J. M.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

*International Arbitration amongst the Greeks.* By MARCUS NIEBUH TOD, M.A. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1913.

It may be said at once that this is a scholarly and exhaustive treatment of the subject based upon a complete collection of the sources, both literary

and epigraphical. The latter sources are enumerated with dates and a few comments. It was obviously impossible to reproduce all the inscriptions with an adequate commentary, but those that are scattered throughout the journals and are not readily accessible might well have been printed. The plan of the book emphasizes the occasions and methods of arbitration, rather than its history. There are chapters on the kind of disputes submitted to arbitration, the appointment of the tribunal, the procedure, the evidence, and the award. The last chapter is devoted to an excellent historical survey of the development and influence of arbitration in the Greek world. It seems unnecessary to attempt to trace the origin of arbitration to the Orient. It was inevitable that a people who developed their administration of justice from voluntary arbitration should at an early period in their history apply the same method to the settlement of intertribal disputes. The elaborate system of official arbitration devised by the Athenians and operated side by side with their popular courts shows how strongly the Greeks were attached to the practice of arbitration.

A portion of the historical sketch might well have been devoted to an account of the origin and employment of arbitration for the settlement of private disputes. The widespread practice (p. 125) of having arbitral courts attempt mediation before giving a final decision finds a parallel in the Athenian system. Public arbitrators were required always to attempt an amicable settlement before giving a verdict on the merits of the dispute. The absence of an index of sources that would enable students to assemble readily the scattered discussions of particular inscriptions is regrettable.

R. J. BONNER

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

## Recent Books

Foreign books in this list may be obtained of Lemcke & Buchner, 30-32 West 27th St., New York City; G. E. Stechert & Co., 151-55 West 25th St., New York City.

BICE, HIRAM H. *Sight Reading in Latin for the Second Year*. Boston: Ginn & Co. Pp. 12+159. \$0.50.

EDWARDS, G. M. *Salamis*. In easy Attic Greek, with introduction, notes, and vocabulary. Cambridge University Press. \$0.45 net.

FERGUSON, W. SCOTT. *Greek Imperialism*. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin Co. Pp. 14+258. \$2.00.

HESELTINE, MICHAEL. *Petronius*. With an English translation, by Michael Heseltine. *Seneca*. With an English translation, by W. H. D. Rouse. New York: Macmillan (Loeb Classical Library). Pp. 21+418. \$1.50 net.

LEO, F. *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*. 1. Bd. Die archäische Literatur. Berlin. IV, pp. 496. M. 12.

MOYLE, J. B. *Justinian's Institutes*. Translated into English, with an index. Clarendon Press. Pp. 228. 5s. net.

RICHARDS, J. F. *Vergil's Aeneid*, book ii. With introduction, text, notes, and lexicon. Clive. Pp. 140. 1s. 6d. net.

ROUSE, W. H. D. See Heseltine.

*Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*. Vol. V, fasc. 5; Vol. VI, fasc. 1, et Suppl., fasc. 4. Leipzig. M. 23.20.

WHITE, HORACE. *Appian's Roman History*. With an English translation. In 4 vols. Vol. IV. New York: Macmillan (Loeb Classical Library). Pp. v+683. \$1.50 net.

WINSTEDT, E. O. *Cicero's Letters to Atticus*. With an English translation. In 3 vols. Vol III. New York: Macmillan (Loeb Classical Library). Pp. 11+439. \$1.50 net.